APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,275	10/22/2008	Steffan Gottfried Klein	P-9035-US	5419

49443   7590   03/28/2011
Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway
12th Floor
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER
RAVETTI, DANTE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3685	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/28/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@pczlaw.com
Arch-USPTO@pczlaw.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/588,275	KLEIN, STEFFAN GOTTFRIED
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANTE RAVETTI	3685	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 February 2011*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-59* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-39* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *40-59* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 August 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1.   This communication is in response to the ameded Application No. 10/588,275

filed on 10 February 2011.

2.   Claims 1-39 have been cancelled by the Applicant.

3.   Claims 40-59 are currently pending and have been fully examined.

4.   For the purpose of applying the prior art, PreGrant Publications will be

referred to using a four digit number within square brackets, e.g. [0001].

Response to Applicant's Remarks/Amendments

5.   Applicant's response, filed on 10 February 2011, has been fully considered, but

are not persuasive.

Applicant's Argument #1:

Applicant argues that the cited prior art of *Hughes*, does not teach or render obvious

Applicant's limitation of:

> wherein the electronic order comprises order critical data that is protected from alteration and
> order data that is not protected.

However, this is an example of non-functional descriptive material.[1]

Applicant's Argument #2:

Applicant then argues:

> Applicant notes that he is acting as his own lexicographer in defining the term 'order critical data'
> to be, for example, in some embodiments, data which is 'critical to the integrity of an order, since

---

[1] In re Gulack, 217 USPQ 401 (Fed. Cir. 1983), In re Ngai, 70 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir. 2004), In re Lowry, 32 USPQ2d
1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); Where the printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate, the printed matter will not
distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability ....[T]he critical question is whether there exists
any new and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate;

alteration has the potential to result in loss of income to the merchant,' as defined on page 4 lines 3-5 of Applicant's Specification as filed.

The Examiner would like to point out that, although the claims are interpreted in light of

the Specification, limitations from the Specification are not read into the claims.[2]

Therefore, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Applicant's Argument #3:

Applicant then argues that the cited prior art of *Hughes*, does not teach or render

obvious Applicant's limitation of:

validation server that verifies the order critical data of an electronic order...;

The cited prior art of *Hughes* teaches:

[0047]**The order processing server** 12 also contains a **number of software programs or routines** for performing various functions needed to process orders. These routines include: a user authentication routine 40 for providing access to the system to users based on data in the user information files 32; an order processing routine 42 for receiving orders from users and updating the data in the order files 34; an *order matching routine 44 for determining when two orders entered on the system are matching and should be executed and entered in the trades file 38;* a rules processing routine 46 for processing the stored rules 36 in the context of specific orders and determining what additional orders should be generated as a result; and a message router 48 for routing messages among the users of the system. The operation of these software routines is described in greater detail below.

[0051]Referring now to FIGS. 2A-2B, one generalized process for generating orders using the trading system of FIG. 1 begins when an **investor generates an order**, step 70. As explained further below, the investor generates the order **by completing information requested in an XML** page downloaded from the order processing server 12. **The order information includes: the identity of the bond being traded, e.g., the CUSIP; the terms of the order including pricing information, whether the order is live or subject, minimum and maximum price amounts which would be accepted for a match, a tail, whether the order can be partially matched and whether the system should generate a new order with any remainder; authorized counterparties who may or should receive the order; and authorized broker dealers and any restrictions on the ability of the broker dealers to submit orders of their own or rebroker the order to others.** The order is transmitted over the Internet to the server, step 72, which validates the order and posts it to the order file, step 74. The order is now available for viewing by all authorized counterparties and broker dealers.

---

[2] See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181,26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993);

Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, one of ordinary skill in the art would know

that the cited *order matching routine 44 for determining when two orders entered (e.g.*

order critical data) on the system are matching (e.g. verifies) and should be executed

and entered in the trades file 38. Additionally, the cited prior art of *Hughes* teaches

what the order information includes (e.g. identity of the bond, the CUSIP, etc.) [0051]

[emphasis added]. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, one of ordinary skill in

the art would know that these different pieces of "order information," is an example of

Applicant's "order critical data." Therefore, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the

Applicant.

Applicant's argument #4:

     Applicant then argues that the protection of "order critical data" is distinct from

"order data." The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.[3]

     Examiner would also like to point out that Official Notice was used in the previous

office action mailed on 10 August 2010 to indicate *the customer downloading product*

details from the commerce server and *using the product details downloaded from the*

commerce server were old and well known in the art.[4] Since Applicant has not

---

[3] In re Harza, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960); Mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless new and unexpected result is produced;

[4] **Jang** (US 2004/0059684); [0034] Referring to FIG. 4, an employee who desires to purchase a product from an Internet electronic commerce site, which is operated by the electronic commerce server 1 of a particular company, connects to the electronic commerce server 1 through the Internet 5 via a PC or mobile phone (3a or 3b) and logs into the electronic commerce server 1 by inputting the ID and password stored in the employee data base 23 (Step 401). The home page of the electronic commerce site operated by the electronic commerce server 1 is displayed on the employees' PC or mobile phone. The employee searches the electronic commerce site. **The control module 20 of the electronic commerce server 1 extracts product information from the product data base 21 and transmits the information via the communication module 24, so that the product information is displayed (Step 402). When the employee decides to purchase a product, the information on the chosen product is provided to the control module 20 of the electronic commerce server 1 via the communication module 24 of the electronic commerce server 1 (Step 403).**

attempted to traverse this Official Notice statement, Examiner is taking the common

knowledge or well-known statement to be admitted prior art.[5]

Examiner would also like to point out that Official Notice was used in the previous

office action mailed on 10 August 2010 to indicate *wherein the order critical data is*

duplicated in said product details, which comprise a first copy of the order critical data in

unencrypted form and *a second copy encrypted*.[6] Since Applicant has not attempted to

traverse this Official Notice statement, Examiner is taking the common knowledge or

well-known statement to be admitted prior art.[7]

Clauses (e.g. whereby, thereby, wherein) that merely states the result of the

limitation(s) of a claim(s) does not limit the scope of the claim(s).[8] Therefore, as recited

in claim 41, wherein the indication of invalidity comprises an indication that the order

critical data has been altered, for example, will not limit the scope of the claim.

This action is a final rejection and is intended to close the prosecution of this

---

[5] See MPEP 2144.03 C;

[6] **Brendel** (US 6,772,333); **A load-balancer assigns incoming requests to servers at a server farm. An atomic operation assigns both un-encrypted clear-text requests and encrypted requests from a client to the same server at the server farm.** An encrypted session is started early by the atomic operation, before encryption is required. The atomic operation is initiated by a special, automatically loaded component on a web page. This component is referenced by code requiring that an encrypted session be used to retrieve the component. Keys and certificates are exchanged between a server and the client to establish the encrypted session. The server generates a secure-sockets-layer (SSL) session ID for the encrypted session. The server also generates a server-assignment cookie that identifies the server at the server farm. The server-assignment cookie is encrypted and sent to the client along with the SSL session ID. The Client decrypts the server-assignment cookie and stores it along with the SSL session ID. The load-balancer uses the SSL session ID along with a server assignment that identifies the server that generated the SSL session ID. When other encrypted requests are generated by the client to the server farm, they include the SSL session ID. The load-balancer uses the SSL session ID to send the requests to the assigned server. When the client sends a non -encrypted clear-text request to the server farm, it includes the decrypted server-assignment cookie. The load balancer parses the clear-text request to find the server-assignment cookie. The load-balancer then sends the request to the assigned server.

[7] See MPEP 2144.03 C;

application. Applicant's reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to this action is limited either to an

appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to an amendment complying

with the requirements set forth below.

If Applicant should desire to appeal any rejection made by the Examiner, a

Notice of Appeal must be filed within the period for reply identifying the rejected claim or

claims appealed. The required appeal fee must accompany the Notice of Appeal.

If Applicant should desire to file an amendment, entry of a proposed amendment

after final rejection cannot be made as a matter of right unless it merely cancels claims

or complies with a formal requirement made earlier. Amendments touching the merits

of the application which otherwise might not be proper may be admitted upon a showing

a good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and why they were not presented

earlier.

A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection must include the appeal from, or

cancellation of, each rejected claim. The filing of an amendment after final rejection,

whether or not it is entered, does not stop the running of the statutory period for reply to

the final rejection unless the Examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, if a Notice of Appeal has not been filed properly within the period for reply,

or any extension of this period obtained under either 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b), the

application will become abandoned.

Applicant also can file for Request for Continuation of Examination (RCE) as

well, in order to enter the newly amended claims and examination of such amended

---

[8] MPEP §2111.04[R-3]; MPEP §2106 II C; MPEP §2114;

claims. Please refer to MPEP.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), can be filed in this application after final rejection.

Therefore, after careful review of all of the Applicant's points of contention, the

original rejections have been maintained below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 40-44, 48-49, 52, 55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over _Hughes et al.,_ (US 2008/0255982) ("_Hughes_") and in view of

Sandhu et al., (US 2002/0116241) ("_Sandhu_").

As to claims 40, 48, 52, 55 and 59:

Hughes teaches substantially as claimed:

providing a validation server connected to the public network ([0005], [0049]);

wherein the electronic order comprises order critical data that is protected from…
and order data that is not protected ([0051], [0054], [0098], [0103], [0105], Table
1 on page 10)

the validation server receiving an electronic order of the customer, generated by
the customer computer, over the public data network from the customer ([0005],
[0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7);

the validation server performing a verification of said order critical data in the
electronic order ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7); and

the validation server generating an indication of the validity or invalidity of the
order critical data based upon said verification ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079],
Figures 1, 2A, 4-7);

Hughes does not expressly teach:

alteration;

However, *Sandhu* expressly teaches:

alteration (Abstract, [0004], [0006]-[0007], [0009], [0011], [0021], [0032], Claims
6 and 11);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify *Hughes* to include the features of *Sandhu* because parties to a

transaction, such as a "purchaser" and "merchant," may desire to alter/change the terms

to a purchase.

As to claim 41:

Hughes teaches substantially as claimed:

wherein the indication of invalidity comprises an indication that the order critical
data has been…([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7);

Hughes does not expressly teach:

altered;

However, *Sandhu* expressly teaches:

altered (Abstract, [0004], [0006]-[0007], [0009], [0011], [0021], [0032], Claims
6 and 11);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify *Hughes* to include the features of *Sandhu* because parties to a

transaction, such as a "purchaser" and "merchant," may desire to alter/change the terms

to a purchase.

As to claim 42:

Hughes expressly teaches:

> further comprising the validation server transmitting the electronic order to at
> least one relevant merchant to be fulfilled in the event that an indication of validity
> is generated ([0063], Figure 4);

As to claim 43:

Hughes expressly teaches:

> further comprising the validation server rejecting the electronic order in the event
> that an indication of invalidity is generated ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures
> 1, 2A, 4-7);

As to claims 44 and 49:

Hughes teaches substantially as claimed:

> further comprising the validation server executing:

> including information indicating whether or not said order critical data is valid
> ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7); and

> to one or more relevant merchants receiving the electronic order thus enabling
> said merchants to identify if order critical data in the electronic order is valid
> ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7);

The combination of *Hughes/Sandhu* discloses as discussed above; however, the

combination of *Hughes/ Sandhu* does not expressly teach:

> generating a report;

> transmitting the report;

However *Sandhu* does expressly teach:

> [0009] It is another object of the present invention to provide a method in which a buyer or purchaser can monitor the processing of purchase orders with third party logistics suppliers to enable buyers to efficiently and cost-effectively schedule personnel and equipment for use. This also allows buyers to modify purchase orders **based upon the representations of third party** logistics suppliers to ensure that appropriate amounts of the products that are the subject of the purchase orders are maintained at all times.

> [0011] **Buyers are allowed to monitor a seller's web server to receive updates as to the status of buyer's purchase orders. The seller's web server is in communication with the third party logistic supplier's website that is updated regularly with information about the status of purchase orders.** Buyers can instantaneously receive information to properly schedule personnel and equipment for use of the product that is the subject of the purchase order, resulting in higher efficiency and cost savings. In addition, this monitoring allows buyers to modify purchase orders by increasing or decreasing the amount of product purchased as a function of their monitoring of the status of purchase orders.

The cited prior art of *Sandhu* teaches the use of "representations" of third party. Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that a "representation" may encompass a "report." Additionally, *Sandhu* teaches a buyer to monitor a web server to view purchase "updates." Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, one of ordinary skill in the art would know that these "updates" operates similarly to generating and transmitting "reports." Therefore, a predictable result of *Sandhu* would have been to *generating a report* and *transmitting the report* because it teaches the similar function of updating a web server of information.[9]

---

[9] Ex parte Smith, 83 USPQ2d 1509 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 2007); Claims in application for patent on pocket insert for book are obvious in view of combination of two prior art patents, since claims are combinations that merely unite old elements with no change in their respective functions, and which yield predictable results, since neither applicant's specification nor her arguments present any evidence that modifications necessary to effect combinations are uniquely challenging or difficult for person of ordinary skill in art, and

As to claim 45 and 56:

Hughes teaches substantially as claimed:

> to the customer computer over the public data network ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7); and

> generating the electronic order ([0005], [0049], [0062], [0079], Figures 1, 2A, 4-7);

Hughes does not expressly teach:

> the customer downloading product details from the commerce server;

> using the product details downloaded from the commerce server.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that *the customer downloading product details from the commerce server* and *using the product details downloaded from the commerce server* is old and well known, in the related art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of *Hughes* with the commonly recognized practice of *the customer downloading product details from the commerce server* and *using the product details downloaded from the commerce server* because transmitting "product details" to customers is an efficient method of providing customer with information necessary to complete a purchase.[10]

---

since claimed improvement is no more than simple substitution of one known element for another, or mere application of known technique to piece of prior art ready for improvement.
[10] *Jang* (US 2004/0059684); [0034] Referring to FIG. 4, an employee who desires to purchase a product from an Internet electronic commerce site, which is operated by the electronic commerce server 1 of a particular company, connects to the electronic commerce server 1 through the Internet 5 via a PC or mobile phone (3a or 3b) and logs into the electronic commerce server 1 by inputting the ID and password stored in the employee data base 23 (Step 401). The home page of the electronic commerce site operated by the electronic commerce server 1 is displayed on the employees' PC or mobile phone. The employee searches the electronic commerce site. The control module 20 of the electronic commerce server 1 extracts product information from the product data base 21 and transmits the information via the communication module 24, so that the product information is displayed (Step 402). When the employee decides to purchase a product, the information on the chosen product is provided to the control module 20 of the electronic commerce server 1 via the communication module 24 of the electronic commerce server 1 (Step 403).

8.   Claims 46-47, 50-51, 53-54 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

being unpatentable over the combination of *Hughes/Sandhu* and in view of <u>Wasilewski</u>,

(US 2003/0018976) ("*Wasilewski*").

<u>As to claims 46, 50, 53, 57:</u>

The combination of *Hughes/Sandhu* discloses as discussed above; however, the

combination of *Hughes/Sandhu* does not expressly disclose:

> wherein said product details comprises the order critical data and wherein the
> order critical data is digitally signed with a secret key, and

> wherein:

> the step of transmitting comprises transmitting the digital signature along with the
> electronic order; and

> the step of verifying comprises the validation server verifying that the digital
> signature corresponds with the order critical data.

However, <u>Wasilewski</u> expressly teaches:

> wherein said product details comprises the order critical data and wherein the
> order critical data is digitally signed with a secret key ([0028]-[0029], [0030],
> [0032], [0035]); and wherein:

> the step of transmitting comprises transmitting the digital signature along with the
> electronic order ([0002], [0013], [0031]-[0032], [0035]-[0036], Claims 10, 17, 28
> 30); and

> the step of verifying comprises the validation server verifying that the digital
> signature corresponds with the order critical data ([0013], [0032], [0035]-[0036]);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the combination of *Hughes/Sandhu* to include the features of

Wasilewski because they are in the related art of processing ecommerce transactions.

As to claims 47, 51, 54, 58:

The combination of _Hughes/Sandhu_ discloses as discussed above; however, the

combination of _Hughes/Sandhu_ does not expressly disclose:

> wherein the order critical data is duplicated in said product details, which
> comprise a first copy of the order critical data in unencrypted form and a second
> copy encrypted using a secret key, and wherein:
>
> the step of transmitting includes transmitting the encrypted copy of the order
> critical data along with the electronic order; and
>
> the step of verifying includes the validation server verifying that the encrypted
> data corresponds with the unencrypted order critical data in the electronic order.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that _wherein the order critical data is duplicated in_

said product details, which comprise a first copy of the order critical data in unencrypted

form and _a second copy encrypted_ is old and well known. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the

teachings of _Hughes/Sandhu_ with the commonly recognized practice of _wherein the_

order critical data is duplicated in said product details, which comprise a first copy of the

order critical data in unencrypted form and _a second copy encrypted is old and well_

known because sending "duplicate" requests aids in ensuring that the requests are

received to be processed. [11]

---

[11] **Brendel** (US 6,772,333); **A load-balancer assigns incoming requests to servers at a server farm. An atomic operation assigns both un-encrypted clear-text requests and encrypted requests from a client to the same server at the server farm.** An encrypted session is started early by the atomic operation, before encryption is required. The atomic operation is initiated by a special, automatically loaded component on a web page. This component is referenced by code requiring that an encrypted session be used to retrieve the component. Keys and certificates are exchanged between a server and the client to establish the encrypted session. The server generates a secure-sockets-layer (SSL) session ID for the encrypted session. The server also generates a server-assignment cookie that identifies the server at the server farm. The server-assignment cookie is encrypted and sent to the client along with the SSL session ID. The Client decrypts the server-assignment cookie and stores it along with the SSL session ID. The load-balancer stores the SSL session ID along with a server assignment that identifies the server that generated the SSL session ID. When other encrypted requests are generated by the client to the server farm, they include the SSL session ID. The load-balancer uses the SSL session ID to send the requests to the assigned server.

However, _Wasilewski_ expressly teaches:

> the step of transmitting includes transmitting the encrypted copy of the order critical data along with the electronic order ([0002], [0013], [0031]-[0032], [0035]-[0036], Claims 10, 17, 28 30); and

> the step of verifying includes the validation server verifying that the encrypted data corresponds with the unencrypted order critical data in the electronic order ([0002], [0013], [0031]-[0032], [0035]-[0036], Claims 10, 17, 28 30);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of _Hughes/Sandhu_ to include the features of _Wasilewski_ because they are both in the related art of processing ecommerce transactions.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

---

When the client sends a non -encrypted clear-text request to the server farm, it includes the decrypted server-assignment cookie. The load balancer parses the clear-text request to find the server-assignment cookie. The load-balancer then sends the request to the assigned server.

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jang (US 2004/0059684); [0034] Referring to FIG. 4, an employee who desires to purchase a product from an Internet electronic commerce site, which is operated by the electronic commerce server 1 of a particular company, connects to the electronic commerce server 1 through the Internet 5 via a PC or mobile phone (3a or 3b) and logs into the electronic commerce server 1 by inputting the ID and password stored in the employee data base 23 (Step 401). The home page of the electronic commerce site operated by the electronic commerce server 1 is displayed on the employees' PC or mobile phone. The employee searches the electronic commerce site. *The control module 20 of the electronic commerce server 1 extracts product information from the product data base 21 and transmits the information via the communication module 24, so that the product information is displayed (Step 402). When the employee decides to purchase a product, the information on the chosen product is provided to the control module 20 of the electronic commerce server 1 via the communication module 24 of the electronic commerce server 1 (Step 403).*

Brendel (US 6,772,333); *A load-balancer assigns incoming requests to servers at a server farm. An atomic operation assigns both un-encrypted clear-text requests and encrypted requests from a client to the same server at the server farm.* An encrypted session is started early by the atomic operation, before encryption is required. The atomic operation is initiated by a special, automatically loaded component on a web page. This component is referenced by code requiring that an encrypted session be used to retrieve the component. Keys and certificates are exchanged between a server and the client to establish the encrypted session. The server generates a secure-sockets-layer (SSL) session ID for the encrypted session. The server also generates a server-assignment cookie that identifies the server at the server farm. The server-assignment cookie is encrypted and sent to the client along with the SSL session ID. The Client decrypts the server-assignment cookie and stores it along with the SSL session ID. The load-balancer stores the SSL session ID along with a server assignment that identifies the server that generated the SSL session ID. When other encrypted requests are generated by the client to the server farm, they include the SSL session ID. The load-balancer uses the SSL session ID to send the requests to the assigned server. When the client sends a non -encrypted clear-text request to the server farm, it includes the decrypted server-assignment cookie. The load balancer parses the clear-text request to find the server-assignment cookie. The load-balancer then sends the request to the assigned server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Mr. Dante Ravetti whose telephone number is (571) 270-3609. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday 9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Calvin Hewitt may be reached at (571) 272-6709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 270-4609.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1-(866) 217-9197. If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 1-(800) 786-9199 (IN USA or CANADA) or 1-(571) 272-1000.

/Dante Ravetti/
Examiner, Art Unit 3685
Saturday, March 19, 2011

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685